

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-9 and 11-15 are pending in this application.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 8, 9 and 11 are amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 6. Claim 6 is canceled, and claim 12 is amended to change its dependency from claim 6 to claim 1.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); and (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration (as the amendments only amend the independent claims to incorporate the subject matter of a dependent claim). Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5-9 and 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,215,523 to Anderson. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Anderson does not disclose an enlargement instruction device that issues an instruction for enlarged display of an image that is being displayed at a display device based upon a second image data, and a control device performing the enlarged display of the image that is being displayed at the display device based upon the second image data by using the first image data which have been read, as originally recited in claim 6, and currently recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 8, 9 and 11.

The Office Action asserts that Anderson discloses that the display of the image is enlarged from 288x216 pixels to 640x480 pixels at col. 8, lines 26-35 in the rejection of claim 6. However, Anderson only discloses that the display according to the scrennail image data 608 and the display according to the compressed image data 604 have the same size that corresponds to the LCD screen 402. Anderson discloses that the scrennail image 608 is display-sized and fills the visible area of the LCD screen 402 when displayed (col. 7, lines 60-

62). Anderson also discloses that this feature enables a digital camera to quickly display a full-sized version of a captured image in the LCD 402 without the delay incurred by first decompressing the higher-resolution JPEG image and resizing it to fit on the LCD 402 (col. 8, lines 26-35). Also see col. 13, lines 16-40 and Figs. 11B-11D.

On the other hand, Anderson discloses that the additional information includes a resized thumbnail 704 showing a larger view (120 x 90 pixels) of a currently selected image (col. 11, lines 12-16). However, both small and large thumbnail 700 and 704 are displayed using the same thumbnail image data 606 (col. 12, lines 35-37). Anderson does not disclose a control device performing the enlarged display of the image that is being displayed at the display device based upon the second image data by using the first image data which have been read. Therefore, Anderson does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1, 8, 9 and 11.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 7 and 12 are patentable over Anderson at least in view of the patentability of claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for additional features they recite.

For example, with regard to claim 12, because Anderson does not disclose the enlargement instruction device that issues an instruction for enlarged display of the image that is being displayed at the display device based upon the second image data, as mentioned above, Anderson, of course, does not disclose that the control device invalidates the instruction for the enlarged display issued by the enlargement instruction device while reading the first image data is in progress. On the other hand, according to claim 12, the control device invalidates the instruction for the enlarged display while reading the first image data is in progress. Also, according the Office Action's assertion, if the scrennail quality is of its display on the LCD screen 402, the first image does not need to be displayed on the display device anymore. Therefore, Anderson does not disclose the additional features recited in claim 12.

With regard to claim 13, Anderson discloses that a plurality of small thumbnails 700 is displayed (Fig. 8) and the additional information includes a resized thumbnail 704 showing a larger view (120 x 90 pixels) of the currently selected image (col. 11, lines 12-16, Fig. 8). However, as discussed above, both small and large thumbnail 700 and 704 are displayed in the review mode using the same thumbnail image data 606 (col. 12, lines 35-37). Anderson does not disclose a control device that displays a plurality of thumbnail images at the display device by reading a plurality of sets of thumbnail image data recorded in the recording medium, reads second image data recorded in the recording medium before reading first image data recorded in the recording medium corresponding to a thumbnail image selected from the plurality of thumbnail images on display and displays an image at the display device based upon the second image data having been read. In other words, Anderson does not disclose that a plurality of thumbnail images are displayed at the display device by reading a plurality of sets of thumbnail image data recorded in the recording medium, and an image corresponding to a thumbnail image selected from the plurality of thumbnail images is displayed at the display device based upon the second image data. Also, Anderson does not disclose reading second image data before reading first image data corresponding to a thumbnail image selected from the plurality of thumbnail images on display.

For at least the above reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 7-9 and 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-3, 5, 7-9 and 11-15 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

Gang Luo
Registration No. 50,559

MAC:GL/gck

Date: September 15, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461